

## REMARKS

Claims 12-19 are now pending in the application. Claims 12 and 16 are currently amended. By this amendment, Claims 1-10, 21 and 22 are cancelled. No new claims are added. Support for the foregoing amendment can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 12-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamichi (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0085498) ("Nakamichi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12-19 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to loss of novelty. Therefore, Applicant has amended independent claims 12 and 16 in order to clarify a difference between the present invention and Nakamichi.

In Nakamichi, the processing unit 30 is provided all functions for calculating the shortest path and generating the routing table, including function of the LSDB search unit of the present invention (as shown in reference numeral 30 of FIG. 2 and [0052]-[0055] of Nakamichi). Meanwhile, since Applicant's claimed invention includes a "link state database (LSDB) search unit that is provided in an interface . . .", it is obvious that the link state database (LSDB) search unit is not included in a RS (Route Server) of the present invention to which the processing unit of Nakamichi corresponds.

Accordingly, the LSDB search unit of the previous invention is included in the interface and not in the RS, while in contrast, the LSDB search unit of Nakamichi is included in the processing unit (RS in the present invention) and not in the interface. The difference between the present invention and Nakamichi is clear as explained above. In addition, as required by the Examiner, Claims 12-19 are amended in order to clarify the novelty. Therefore, it is obvious that Claims 12-19 have novelty and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be resolved.

Moreover, it is also clear that the present invention is not obvious over Nakamichi. In Nakamichi, the processing unit 30 is provided all functions for calculating the shortest path and generating the routing table, including function of the LSDB search unit of the present invention. In accordance with such a constitution, all operations are processed by only the processing unit 30 which is problematic since this is a substantial amount of processing load.

Meanwhile, in the present invention, the LSDB search unit is included in the interfaces. In accordance with such a constitution, since each of the interfaces (such as the interface cards) can perform a function detecting whether the control packet is new or old, a process electing new (up-to-date) information from the newly received information can be dispersed and performed on each of the interfaces. As a result, since all operations do not need to be processed by only the processing unit (or RS), it is possible to disperse a large amount of processing load and decrease the load more than Nakamichi and the traditional invention. Therefore, Applicant asserts that Claims 12 and 16 have novelty and Claims 12-19 are patentable.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basu (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0100950 A1) ("Basu") in view of Nakamichi and Hassell (U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,650 B1) ("Hassell"). Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basu in view of Nakamichi, Hassell, and further in view of Dobbins (U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,772) ("Dobbins"). Since claims 1-10, 21 and 22 are cancelled, this rejection should now be rendered moot.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 2, 2009

By: Gregory A. Stobbs  
Gregory A. Stobbs  
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GAS/dec